

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed January 22, 2008. In the office action the Examiner:

- objected to the drawings, specifically reference characters not mentioned in the description and Figure 9B;
- objected to the specification, and in particular paragraphs 0054, 00143 and 00152;
- rejected claims 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter; and
- rejected claims 15-22 and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Moody et al. (US 2005/0144157, hereinafter *Moody*).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims include: claims 15-22 and 33-37.

Office Actions in related applications

The pending application is related to US Patent Application serial number 10/816,428. An office action on that application was mailed October 31, 2007 and a response was filed February 27, 2008. The Examiner is encouraged to review the art made of record, the Office Action and the response in the above-mentioned related application.

AMENDMENTS TO SPECIFICATION

The change to paragraph 0054 conforms to the use of a trademark. (See MPEP § 608.01(v))

All reference numbers in the figures that the Examiner identified as not appearing in the specification text are now included in the specification text. The changes to paragraphs 0062, 0065, 0066, 0072, 0076, 0077, 0080, 00102, 00116, and 00152 conform text to reference numbers in Figures 5A, 6A, 6D, 7B, 7C, 9B, 12, and 15.

The changes to paragraphs 0098 and 00101 are made to correct informalities.

The changes to paragraph 00143 are supported by Fig. 19. Furthermore, it is well known that the term “computer readable storage medium” and “memory” or “memory device” are often used interchangeably.

Furthermore, Figure 9B has not been amended as requested by Examiner. Reference number 823 corresponds to the misspelled word “delying” and reference number 832 corresponds to the “spell correction window” as correctly described in paragraph 0080. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

No new matter has been added by the changes described above.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS

Claims 23-31 and 38-40 are canceled.

Claim 15 is amended to include "at a server", "from a client", "a plurality of conversations", "at least two conversations each having two or more messages," and "to the client a list of the identified conversations". Support can be found at least in Fig. 15 and paragraphs 0046, 0098-0101, and 0113-0116 of the application as published.

Claims 16 is amended to reference the antecedent "plurality of conversations" in claim 15.

Claims 17-19 are amended to correctly reference or identify the various changes for which claim limitations are being stated.

Claim 20 is amended to include "two or more messages," "two or more conversations" and "each conversation having a respective conversation identifier, wherein at least one respective conversation of the plurality of conversations comprises two or more messages." Support can be found at least in Fig. 15 and paragraphs 0046, 0098-0101, and 0113-0116 of the application as published.

Claims 21 and 22 are amended to conform to revised claim 20.

Claim 32 has been amended to include "computer readable storage medium ..." and "a plurality of two conversations". Support can be found at least in Figures 15 and 19 and paragraphs 0046, 0098-0101, 0113-0116 and 0143-0150 of the application as published.

Claims 33-36 are amended to correctly reference or identify the various changes for which claim limitations are being stated.

Claim 37 has been amended to include "computer readable storage medium ...," "two or more messages" and "each conversation having a respective conversation identifier, wherein at least one respective conversation of the plurality of conversations comprises two or more messages." Support can be found at least in Figs. 15 and 19 and paragraphs 0046, 0098-0101, 0113-0116 and 0143-0150 of the application as published.

35 U.S.C. 101

The amendments to the preambles of claims 32 and 37 are believed to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101. As revised, claims 32-37 are directed to patentable subject matter, and are supported by at least Fig. 19 and the corresponding text in the specification.

***Moody* does not teach identifying and returning a list of conversations.**

Claims 15 and 20 are directed to searching for conversations relevant to a search query, where at least two of the conversations each have email messages sharing “a common set of characteristics that meet a predefined criteria,” and producing or returning a list of conversations as a search result. *Moody* does not teach:

identifying **a plurality of conversations** relevant to the search query, the plurality of conversations **including at least two conversations each having two or more messages sharing a common set of characteristics that meet predefined criteria** and a respective conversation identifier;

and

returning to the client a list of the identified conversations as a search result to the search query.

(Claim 15, emphasis added)

because *Moody* teaches a conventional email management system for searching messages and displaying the messages within a thread resulting from the search. (See *Moody*, Fig. 2, reference 224 and paragraph 34.) The messages are displayed to the user, according to *Moody*, if they contain search terms entered in the subject-line of a query box or if they are related to the searched messages. (See *Moody*, paragraph 55, lines 1-6). This can be a cumbersome list of email messages when a user has thousands of emails in the user’s email account. The entire list of messages is displayed to the user, in *Moody*, one thread at a time. Alternately, *Moody* can display the entire list of messages matching a query to the user, without threading.

The Office Action incorrectly equates messages to conversations. (See page 6 of Office Action) In contrast, in amended claims 15 and 20, “at least two conversations each [have] two or more messages” Thus, conversations and messages are distinct entities. The present invention treats conversations as units of information, such as by “returning ... a list of the identified conversations.” Thus, organizing the messages into conversations allows multiple threads of messages to be displayed in a “list of identified conversations”, and resolves the problem, apparent in *Moody*, of having to sort through a long list of emails. Nowhere does *Moody* teach organizing messages into searchable conversations, and displaying a list of the conversations (as recited in claims 15 and 20) instead of listing the actual messages (as taught by *Moody*).

Independent claims 32 and 37 are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as claims 15 and 20, respectively.

Dependent claims 16-19, 21-22 and 33-36 are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 22, 2008

/ Gary S. Williams /

31,066

Gary S. Williams

(Reg. No.)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 843-4000